REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed November 3, 2004.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17-19, 21 and 37 have been amended. Claims 38-

40 are presented new. The amendments and new claims are supported at least at

pages 23-24, 137, 141-142, 179-186 of the specification. No new matter has been

introduced in this amendment. Claims 22-31 were previously canceled. Claims 32,

34 and 36 are canceled with this amendment. After entry of this amendment, claims

1-21 and 33, 35 and 37-40 are pending.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 112

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite for the phrase "to

task assistant." The rejection has been overcome by the above amendment.

Rejection Under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-21 and claims 32-37 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being

anticipated by Borghesi (US Patent No. 5,950,169). Applicants submit that the above

amendments overcome this rejection because Borghesi fails to disclose all limitations

of the claims as presently amended.

Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended. Specifically, claim 1 (and

similarly claims 8 and 15) recites "allowing the user to ~~input~~ create the rules during

the execution phase of the program that processes the tasks and the rules by way of

the user interface of the client component, wherein said rules ~~which~~ dictate which of

the tasks should be selected based on predetermined events defined in said rules,

receiving at least one event, and outputting the task which is <u>automatically</u> selected

based on the received event in accordance with the rules."

As claimed, the computer program allows the user to create the rules. This is

in contrast to the rejection's basis that Borghesi discloses the "input" of rules, such as

by selection of "events sorted by date/time." (Office Action, p.3).

As claimed, the computer program allows the tasks to be automatically

selected based on the predetermined events defined in the rules and the received event

in accordance the rules. This is in contrast to the rejection's basis that Borghesi

discloses the "that tasks may selected based on predetermined events, such as

predetermined events shown in box 352." (Office Action, p.3).

The Figures 14 and 15 and accompanying description of Borghesi do not

support the stated rejection. Borghesi fails to disclose these claim limitations as

evidenced by its description accompanying FIGS. 14 and 15. (see col. 15, lines 10-

29).

"As additional explanation of the event log steps discussed in FIG. 8H that may be performed according to a preferred embodiment. FIGS. 13-15 provide an illustration of the steps a user may take through the graphic user interface. The event log records events/actions taken with respect to each insurance datafile. The event log, which is attached to the datafile, preferably automatically puts a time and date stamp on certain predetermined tasks or activities. There also may be manually entered event information added to the log. As is indicated in FIG. 13, the event log may be selected for viewing through the user interface. By clicking onto the event log tab in an opened workfile, an event screen 350 is shown listing the date, time, type of action and author of each event. A specific event may be selected to view, or to enter, additional textual information concerning the selected event.

> To manually enter an event, a user may select from an event description menu 352 and either click on the relevant description or type in the code for the description as is shown in FIG. 14. FIG. 15 shows a setup menu with the table 354 of predetermined events that are available for selection in the events tab. The event log is useful both for appraisers/adjusters and insurance company managers to monitor claim processing efficiency. In one embodiment, only certain users may alter or add to the event log based on login identification, passwords or other security means."
> (col. 15, lines 8-33)

As seen above, Borghesi fails to disclose the automated generation of tasks to be completed based on predetermined events defined in rules created by users, as recited by independent claims 1, 8 and 15. Accordingly, the rejection against the independent claims and all the pending dependent claims should be withdrawn.

In addition, the rejections against several dependent claims should be withdrawn for separate reasons:

o Claims 3, 10 and 17 recite that "the task is automatically selected based on the event received from the event queue." This limitation is not found in Borghesi.

o Claims 5, 12 and 38 recite that the event is matched with the predetermined event in the rules to select the task. This limitation is not found in Borghesi.

o Claims 7, 14 and 21 recite that the automatically selected tasks are displayed on a list prior to completion. This limitation is not found in Borghesi.

o Claim 18 recites that the server component comprises the event queue populated with events generated by data entered by the user. The rejection is based on Borghesi that discloses a list on the client component, but fails to disclose an event queue on a server component for queuing events. (Office Action pp. 3-4).

    ○ Claims 11 and 39 recite that the rules identify claim characteristics for use in automatically selecting the outputted task. Claim 40 recites that the claim characteristic includes the line of business associate with the claims, such as automobile, yachts, and property insurance. These limitations are not found in Borghesi.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _5/2/05_

Marc V. Richards
Marc V. Richards
Registration No. 37,921
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312)321-4200